

**ACTION SHEET
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**March 2, 2016
to be reconvened on March 9, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates Richard Shea, John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Joseph Almeida

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- A. 687 Middle Street (*Request to postpone to March 9, 2016 meeting.*)
- B. 275 Islington Street
- C. 7-9-15 Pickering Avenue

The Commission voted to postpone item A to the March 9, 2016 meeting.

The Commission voted to approve item B with the following stipulations: 1) that the proposed elevations as submitted were not representative of the changes requested; and 2) that the plan shall not be provided to the site contractor in order to avoid someone coming back to the Commission with more changes, as presented.

The Commission voted to approve item C with the following stipulation: 1) that the new Azek shall be field painted.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Walter W. and Patricia B. Bardenwerper, owners**, for property located at **69 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing with gates) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 40 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That approval is given subject to receiving Board of Adjustment approval.
- 2) The 3 ½" fascia board shall have a beaded edge as discussed.
- 3) The front fence shall be reduced to 42" along the public way.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
- Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
- Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
- Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
- Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
- Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
- Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
- Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
- Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

2. Petition of **Tanner Bridge Development, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) This approval is exclusively limited to item numbers: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 as noted on Sheet 1 dated March 2, 2016. The other items (1, 2 & 4) have been removed from this approval.
- 2) The proposed elevations do not represent the requested changes and are not approved as shown. Only the noted changes listed in 1) are approved and new elevations shall be submitted prior to issuance of the building permit in order to clearly reflect the approved items on the previously approved elevations.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
- Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
- Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
- Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
- Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
- Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
- Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
- Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
- Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

3. Petition of **Julian Frey and Ana Barndollar, owners**, for property located at **59 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove chimney) and allow exterior changes to an existing structure (remove one window, replace with siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 48 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) The removal of the greenhouse window is approved but the removal of the chimney is not approved.
- 2)

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
- Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
- Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
- Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
- Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
- Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
- Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
- Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
- Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

4. Petition of **Darryl E. Mojdehi, owner**, for property located at **137 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 55 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) The HDC has a strong preference to not include the casement egress windows in the approval given the impact to the historical integrity of this structure; therefore, use of any casement windows shall require administrative approval from the HDC.
- 2) All window trim shall be wood and the use of Azek is not approved.
- 3) A half screen shall be used.
- 4) A 6/6 grill pattern shall be used.
- 5) The Commission shall visit the site to confirm that the existing windows are replacement windows prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
- Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
- Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
- Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
- Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
- Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
- Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures

- Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
 Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

5. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **121/123 State Street Condominium Association, owner, and Mark and Marie Bodi, applicants**, for property located at **121 State Street, #2**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new, larger deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 48-2 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
 Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
 Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
 Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
 Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
 Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
 Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
 Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
 Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Review of Design Guidelines (*Request to postpone to March 9, 2016 meeting.*)

This item was postponed to the March 9, 2016 meeting.

B. Discussion of 2016 Work Plan

There was brief discussion regarding exemptions, draft character-based zoning for the west end, update to the 3D model, and demolition.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:45 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Planning Department Administrative Clerk